

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/779,866	02/08/2001		James E. Pricer	9517	6672	
26890	7590	11/07/2003		EXAMINER		
JAMES M		-	HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G			
NCR CORPORATION 1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DAYTON,	OH 45479	9	2172		Z	
•				DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003	\mathcal{O}	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$-\!$
	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/779,866	PRICER, JAMES E.	
-	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Monplaisir G Hamilton	2172	
The MAILING DATE f this communication appe	ars n the c ver sheet with the d	corresp ndenc address	
THE REPLY FILED 07 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in	i i
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appropriate extending of the fee. The appropriate extending of the final Office action	ension on; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>07 October 2003</u>. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendm	ent
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place th	те
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-27.	:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10.			

Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that the finality of the action should be withdrawn because a new ground of rejection was presented. Examiner holds that pursuant to 37 CFR 1.97 (c), MPEP 706.07 (a) and 2112 new art was not introduced prior to making the office action final, the art used to make the Rejection Final was presented to Applicant prior to Finality. Examiner holds that Anderson has been applied throughout the prosecution of this application. Furthermore, an inherency argument was set-forth to clarify the similarity between Anderson's analysis of buying behavior and the claimed analysis of transactions to determine associations in order of transactions. Examiner holds that making the office action final was proper. Applicant further argues that the buying behavior and the claimed analysis of transaction groups to determine associations in the order of the transactions are not equivalent. Examiner however disagrees with applicant. One can't determine if a consumer has a habit without analyzing a set of transaction over a period of time. Therefore examiner holds that to determine that a set of consumer always buy milk on the third Friday of a month, the system disclosed by would have to determine the relationship between these consumers transaction information. Examiner holds that Anderson does implicitly disclose the claimed "analysis of the groups of transactions to find associations in the order of the transactions in the groups.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100